

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-6, and 8-12 were rejected by the Examiner. More specifically:

- Claims 1, 3, 6, and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,628,779 (Pietrwicz) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,166,576 (Stave);
- Claims 4, 8, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Pietrwicz in view of Stave and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,493,246 (Anderson); and
- Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Pietrwicz in view of Stave and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,382,646 (Szabo)

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1, 3-6, and 8-12 will be pending. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants request that the above-listed rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, and 8-12 as obvious over various combinations of references. Of those claims, claims 1, 6, and 10 are in independent form. Applicants traverse this rejection.

Independent claims 1, 6, and 10 all require that impedance be adjusted in order to improve rejection of common mode **noise**. The reference cited as disclosing this element, Pietrwicz, does not disclose adjusting impedance to improve the rejection of common mode noise. Pietrwicz is described as a method and system for providing “suppression of near-end speech energy for tone signal detectors.” Pietrwicz, Abstract. In the portion of the reference cited by the Examiner as disclosing this element, Pietrwicz states that the “differential amplifier will subtract the signals from each other and create a receive signal 3 where the **near-end speech energy has been canceled.**” Pietrwicz, Col. 12, ll. 38-41. In fact, Pietrwicz does not mention the rejection of common mode noise as either an intended or unintended result of its impedance matching.

Independent claims 1, 6, and 10 also require the matching of the impedance of the first and second signal lines. Pietrwicz also does not disclose this element. Pietrwicz attempts to match the impedance of the “balance networks M1 through Mn 22” to the “combined impedance

of the loop 12 and office equipment 11.” Pietrwicz, Col. 12, ll. 33-35; Col. 14, ll. 64-67.

Pietrwicz nowhere discloses that the impedance of the tip and ring lines are matched.

Moreover, Stave does not remedy the above-referenced deficiencies of Pietrwicz.

For the reasons cited above, Applicants submit that claims 1, 6, and 10 are allowable over the cited combination of Pietrwicz and Stave. Claims 3-5, 8, 9, 11, and 12 are believed allowable for at least the reasons cited above by virtue of their dependence from claims 1, 6, or 10, and because no other references cited against claims 3-5, 8, 9, 11, and 12 remedy the above-referenced deficiencies of Pietrwicz. Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 3-6, and 8-12.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding objections and rejections. There being no other rejections, Applicants respectfully request that the current application be allowed and passed to issue.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this Response, or credit any overpayment, to deposit account no. 13-0019.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Molano
Reg. No. 39,777

CUSTOMER NUMBER 26565
MAYER BROWN LLP
P.O. Box 2828
Chicago, IL 60690-2828
Telephone: (312) 701-8286
Facsimile: (312) 706-9000